

## REMARKS


A Restriction Requirement was mailed in the present case on January 11, 2006. Since this response is being timely submitted, no further fee is thought to be due at this time. If any additional fee is due for the continued prosecution of this application, please charge the same to Applicant's Deposit Account No. 50-2555 (Whitaker, Chalk, Swindle & Sawyer, LLP).

The Examiner has required restriction between apparatus Claims 1-7, classified in class 138, subclass 143, and method Claims 8-18, classified in class 427, subclass 528. Applicant hereby elects to prosecute Claims 8-18, without traverse and without prejudice toward filing a divisional application containing withdrawn Claims 1-7.

As Applicant understands the Examiner's remarks, the Examiner has also required an election of species between those claims directed toward an article having a coating layer formed with an electrolyte solution and those claims directed toward forming a coated article without the use of an electrolyte solution. Applicant's review of the original claims indicates that Claims 1-5 do not include the explicit feature of the electrolyte solution, while Claims 6-18 do explicitly include the electrolyte solution feature. Applicant hereby elects the second species of the invention, as set out in Claims 6-18, which include the use of the electrolyte solution in forming the coating on the article.

The above remarks and amendments to the claims are thought to fully address the outstanding office action in the case. An early examination on the merits of the case would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles D. Gunter, Jr., Reg. No. 29,386  
Whitaker, Chalk, Swindle & Sawyer, LLP  
301 Commerce St, Suite 3500  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(817) 878-0504  
ATTORNEY(S) FOR APPLICANT

Date: Jan 18, 2006